

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-60 have been canceled and claims 61-79 have been added.

The Examiner has objected to the Title of the Invention. Applicants have amended the Title, as above set forth. The amended Title is believed to be descriptive of the invention, thereby obviating the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 7 and 35 Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim applicants' invention. The Examiner has further rejected applicants' claims 55, 57 and 59 under 35 USC § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have canceled the aforementioned claims, thereby rendering these rejections moot.

The Examiner has further rejected applicants' claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-26, 28-32, 34-52 and 54-60 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by the Mousseau, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0005864) published patent application. Claims 5, 21, 27, 33 and 53 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the latter reference taken in conjunction with the Watanabe, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0034226) published patent application. Claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-27, 28-33, 34-53 and 54-60 have all been canceled, thereby obviating these rejections. Moreover, to the extent the Examiner believes the rejections remain applicable to newly added claims 61-79, they are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended applicants' claims to better define applicants' invention. More particularly, newly added independent claim 1 recites an information providing system comprising: receiving means adapted to receive electronic mail information; determining means adapted to determine whether or not a destination device of said electronic mail

information can display the electronic mail information; registering means adapted to register the electronic mail information in correspondence with code information; notifying means adapted to notify the code information corresponding to the received electronic mail information to the destination device, if a result of said determining is that the destination device cannot display said electronic mail information; inputting means adapted to input the notified code information to an output device; acquiring means adapted to acquire the electronic mail information based on the inputted code information; and outputting means adapted to output the acquired electronic mail information. Added independent claims 70, 78 and 79 recite similar features.

Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. The Mousseau, et al. reference discloses a system in which an attachment to electronic mail for a mobile device can be re-directed by a host system to attachment displayers either automatically by the host system or by direction of the mobile device user to the host system. There is nothing taught or suggested in the reference, however, as to registering means adapted to register the electronic mail information in correspondence with code information. Nor is there anything taught or suggested of a notifying means adapted to notify the code information corresponding to the received electronic mail information to the destination device, if a result of said determining is that the destination device cannot display said electronic mail information. Finally, there is no teaching or suggestion of inputting means adapted to input the notified code information to an output device, acquiring means adapted to acquire the electronic mail information based on the inputted code information, and outputting means adapted to output the acquired electronic mail information.


The paragraphs of the Mousseau, et al. reference cited by the Examiner, i.e., (paragraphs 0034, 0035, 0042, 0072, 0073, 0076 and 0078), simply do not mention or discuss the above features of the invention, as recited in applicants' independent claims 1, 70, 78 and 79, and their respective dependent claims. Moreover, nothing taught or suggested in the Watanabe, et al. reference to change this conclusion.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims and passage of same and this application to issue is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
T (212) 790-9200

  
John J. Torrente  
Reg. No. 26,359